

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, LABOR AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**  
**OFFICE OF FINANCIAL AND INSURANCE REGULATION**  
**Before the Commissioner of Financial and Insurance Regulation**

**Office of Financial and Insurance Regulation,  
Petitioner**

**v**

**Enforcement Case No. 09-7489**

**First Financial Network, Inc.,  
and  
Eric Swider,  
Respondents**

---

**For the Petitioner:**

**Elizabeth Bolden  
Office of Financial and Insurance Regulation  
P.O. Box 30220  
Lansing, MI 48909-7720**

**For the Respondent:**

**Steven L. Knox  
Seyburn Knox Law Group  
300 Park Street, Suite 385  
Birmingham, MI 48009**

---

**Issued and entered  
this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November 2010  
by Ken Ross  
Commissioner**

**ORDER RESPECTING  
MOTION TO SET ASIDE REVOCATION**

**I. Background**

On April 9, 2010, the insurance producer license of Eric Swider and the insurance agency license of First Financial Network, Inc. were revoked. The revocations were based on the failure of Mr. Swider and First Financial Network (referred to as "Respondents" below) to reply to inquiries from the Office of Financial and Insurance Regulation (OFIR). Licensees of OFIR are required to provide written replies to such inquiries. See Michigan Insurance Code, section 249(a), MCL 500.249(a).

On September 13, 2010 attorney Steven Knox, representing Eric Swider, filed with the Commissioner a motion to set aside the revocation of Mr. Swider's license. (The motion only

addressed the insurance producer license of Eric Swider. No request was made to relicense First Financial Network, Inc.)

On September 20, OFIR staff filed a response to the motion indicating that the staff did not object to setting aside the revocation order. The staff did, however, request that Mr. Swider be required to submit a new insurance producer application in order to ensure “that no license-disqualifying event has occurred since the license was revoked.” The staff noted that Mr. Swider had resolved the matter of the unpaid commissions which were the subject of the original OFIR inquiry. (Documents demonstrating that resolution, a consent agreement with the complainant and proof of payment, were submitted to OFIR by Mr. Swider.)

## **II. Analysis**

It was appropriate to revoke Mr. Swider’s producer license in April 2010. He had failed on repeated occasions over several months to answer an official inquiry from this agency. When his conduct became the subject of an enforcement action, he failed to take advantage of the opportunity to informally resolve the matter with OFIR staff and later failed to appear for a formal administrative hearing. Now Mr. Swider would like to have his license returned. However, to simply reissue a license to Mr. Swider would create new problems. For example, the Commissioner has no way of knowing whether, during the months he was unlicensed, Mr. Swider engaged in any conduct that would disqualify him from holding a producer license. It is also not known whether Mr. Swider has any insurer willing to appoint him, a precondition for licensure.

In addition, it is necessary to determine what administrative sanction is appropriate for Mr. Swider’s failure to respond to the original OFIR inquiries.

The Commissioner notes the staff's support of Mr. Swider's request to receive a license. However, it is not appropriate to issue an order setting aside the final decision of April 9, 2010. Mr. Swider has been unlicensed for approximately five months. Relicensing requirements vary depending upon the length of time an applicant has been unlicensed. Should Mr. Swider elect to reapply for a producer license, he must comply with the license application procedures (pre-licensing education, testing, insurer appointment, etc.) applicable to the length of time between the revocation date and the application date.

### **III. Order**

It is therefore ordered that the motion to set aside the revocation order of April 9, 2010 is denied.

When Respondent Swider has completed the steps necessary for licensure, and a suitable sanction for the original compliance case has been negotiated with OFIR staff, the Commissioner will give consideration to the license application.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'K. Ross', written over a horizontal line.

Ken Ross  
Commissioner